

Legalism surviving, together with Tribalism, into an era of spiritual and universal religion. The orthodox Jew of Russia, Hungary or Poland believes that the Mosaic law is the final revelation, and that no jot or tittle of it is ever to pass away. His relations as a member of the chosen people to the Gentiles, he believes, will always remain unchanged. On the day of Purim he still celebrates a festival of Tribalism and of Semitic revenge by exulting over the execution of Haman and his sons for the offences of the father against the tribe of Israel. Christianity he regards as it was regarded by Caiaphas. But the creed of the Liberal Jew in Paris or New York it would not be very easy to define. Perhaps it may be said to be Theism without belief in the immortality of the soul. Mr. Lucien Wolf accepts for Judaism the designation of "Material Optimism," and says that it holds that the possibilities of human knowledge are limited to the visible world and teaches, in contrast to Christianity, that temporal happiness is the goal of existence and the whole aim of action. The religious question, however, practically is the least part of the matter, and certainly would never by itself give birth to these calamitous disturbances. The Jews are a parasitic race, without a country of their own, declining as a rule labour of the ordinary kind, and spreading over the world to subsist, by money-lending and cognate trades, upon the industry of the Gentiles. They form everywhere a nation apart from the community in which they sojourn, held together by exclusive intermarriage, and at the same time a commercial Ring, the members of which play everywhere into each other's hands. It is in this character that Judaism provokes and always has provoked the enmity of all races, not Christian alone, but Pagan. Mr. Wolf complacently admits "that there is no small amount of truth in the Anti-Semitic assertion that in Germany, at least, the national aspirations are stifled by an overmastering Judaism." He could scarcely have penned a more complete defence of Stöcker. What patriot would not strive to prevent the aspirations of his nation from being stifled, after a heroic and costly struggle for national existence, by the overmastering influence of a tribe of alien stockjobbers? Mr. Wolf asserts the superiority, moral, intellectual, and physical, of his race to all other races with a tribal arrogance which would, in itself, be enough to account for a good deal of unpopularity. Morally, however, it may be doubted whether any portion of civilized humanity is lower than the Russian and Polish Jew. Intellectual sharpness is the natural result of the habit, kept up by the Hebrew through so many centuries, of living by his wits, and not by his hands. In the physique of the Jew there is nothing remarkable; and Renan, who is the best authority, decides against the purity of the race. The Jews, even when in outward appearance squalid, are usually well-off, and have better food than other people of the same class: they marry early; and, happily for them, their women are as yet free from the aversion to maternity which is a feature of the sexual revolution and is becoming the bane of other races. Hence they multiply: yet not faster than the Irish or the French of Quebec. There is, therefore, no necessity for having recourse to the hypothesis of Mr. Wolf, who ascribes magical efficacy to the retention by the Chosen People of the sexual laws and the hygiene of Moses. It would have been a supernatural revelation indeed, if a primeval lawgiver had forestalled the progress of sanitary science for all time. The precept against eating blood, which Mr. Wolf deems invaluable in a hygienic point of view, is in Leviticus not hygienic, but religious. The blood is sacred, and forbidden as food, because it is the life of the animal. Other precepts are local: in the East swine are scavengers, and it is only in Palestine that the hare is a ruminant. In the persistence of the race there is nothing miraculous: the Parsis, another parasitic race, have maintained their separate existence for twelve centuries, and there is no reason why the Armenians should not do the same. Even the Zingari have shown great tenacity of separate life. That a mysterious interest continues to be attached to the Jewish race above other wanderers is mainly due to that very Christianity which Mr. Lucien Wolf holds in such light esteem.

Among the voluminous literature of the great debate between Religion and Science comes a profound treatise by Mr. Arthur on the "Difference Between Physical and Moral Law." The sum of Mr. Arthur's contention is that there are two orders of law differing in the agents ruled by each respectively, physical laws ruling unconscious agents, moral laws ruling conscious and responsible agents. But surely Austin is right in confining the term law to "rules laid down for the guidance of an intelligent being by an intelligent being having power over him." Lewes also, as Mr. Arthur reminds us, said that "law" implied authority and government, and as an Agnostic desired that the word should be dropped out of scientific terminology. Dropped out of scientific terminology it ought to be, if men of science wish, on Agnostic grounds or any other ground,

to keep the Theistic hypothesis out of sight; for, applied to nature, it is distinctly a theological term. The idea of a law cannot be separated from that of a lawgiver, nor can it be attached to that of a mere force. Science can be cognizant of nothing but observed uniformities of phenomena. "Method," which Lewes proposed to substitute for law, plainly carries with it the idea of a Supreme Intelligence. It makes no difference whether the will of the Creator is manifested to us through a Revelation, through our moral nature, or through the operation of physical forces which constrain us under physical penalties to do certain things and abstain from others. When we talk of obedience to the laws of nature, nature is another name for God. As a general rule it is not desirable to be punctilious about terms, and we might be content to let Science use the term law with the understanding that in her language it is merely metaphorical, and simply denotes a uniformity similar to that of a supreme and unvarying will. But unfortunately the term is so steeped in juristic and theological associations that it inevitably carries them with it, enter what caveats you may. The result is that an unfair advantage is given; not to Theism, but to Agnosticism, which is thus enabled to fill the moral void left by its philosophy and reconcile the soul to Atheism by offering to the mind an apparent substitute for God. The "laws" of nature are held up to us as objects of trust and reverence, and devout conformity to them is presented as a scientific religion. But no mere combination of observed uniformities can carry us at most beyond the notion of a cast-iron fate.

A BYSTANDER.

HERE AND THERE.

MR. HOYLE, in our last number, had a perfectly fair answer to those who arraigned the Undertaker's Convention. The Undertakers had a right to "convent," as the Yankees would say, like other citizens, and the somewhat sombre character of their subjects need not prevent them from having a cheerful meeting. No doubt they are just as honourable as any other class of merchants, and supply their customers at a fair price with the goods which the customers demand. But it is hardly true that the customers are under no pressure: they are under the pressure of tyrant fashion, which in the hour of affliction, and when the honour of the beloved dead is supposed to be concerned, it is morally impossible to defy. Thus, in poor families, a heavy burden is too often laid on the survivors, when perhaps the bread-winner has been taken away. It is pretty clear however that a radical change will soon be made in funeral customs. Cremation visibly gains ground. It appeals to sanitary considerations, to taste, to which the protraction of decay by coffin burial is revolting, and to the fear of being buried alive, which horrible occurrences have proved not to be chimerical. Sensible Christian divines like Bishop Fraser, of Manchester, have decided that Christianity is in no way opposed to the change. Mr. Hoyle and his fraternity will soon have to hold a convention to consider the means of providing cremation for those by whom it is preferred.

It is as unnecessary to comment upon Irving's acting each time that he comes here as it is to comment upon the characters in the plays which he acts. What would have been Shakespeare's feelings if he could have seen "Hamlet," or "The Merchant of Venice," put upon the stage as it was the other evening! Three centuries have intervened between the dramatist and the worthy interpretation of his work. It is curious to think how entirely English tragedy and the highest kind of acting are identified in our minds with the Shakespearian drama. Not a single really great tragedy has been produced since the Elizabethan era unless it be "The Cenci," which, by the hideous character of its plot, is excluded from the stage. Even of the Elizabethan dramatists, however, there is not one except Shakespeare who keeps the stage, or whom anybody would wish to see restored to it. So far as we are concerned, one man is all. And about the personal history of that one man we know absolutely nothing, though so many Shakespearian scholars are poring with microscopes over a blank sheet of paper in the hope of tracing some faded characters. The opening of the Shakespear's grave, if it was not too great a sacrilege, might possibly, by revealing the shape of the head, help us to identify the true portrait.

THERE were twenty failures in Canada reported to Bradstreet's during the past week, as compared with thirty-three in the preceding week, and with twenty-six, sixteen, and eleven respectively, in the corresponding weeks of 1883, 1882, and 1881. In the United States there were 213 failures reported to Bradstreet's last week, as compared with 188 in the preceding week, and with 166, 125, and 117 respectively, in the corresponding weeks of 1883, 1882, and 1881. About eighty-five per cent. were those of small traders whose capital was less than \$5,000.